

RECEIVED

EIS000047

SEP 27 1999

**INITIAL COMMENTS ON DOE PROPOSAL TO STORE 70,000 TONS OF  
LONG LIFE RADIO ISOTOPES AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN, IN NEVADA**

Author: F. George Tucker, P.O.Box 26, Amargosa Valley, NV 89020

Tel: 775-372-1041

1 Since I have had no opportunity to read the draft Environmental Impact Statement(EIS), most of my comments at this time will address the failure of the DOE to involve the residents of Amargosa Valley, Beatty and the surrounding districts in the decision making process. Also the failure of the DOE to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

No notices of this crucial meeting(at Amargosa Community Center 9/27/99) have been posted to my knowledge. Good places would be the Post Office, Library, and the Community Center bulletin boards. No mailed notices have been sent to the affected residents.

The regulations governing the implementation of the NEPA require, as examples, Sect. 1500.2(d) "Federal agencies shall to the fullest extent possible(emphasis added): Encourage and facilitate public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment."

Sect. 1506.6(a): "Agencies shall make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures" and (b) "Provide public notice of NEPA related hearings.."

I that wasn't specific enough, there is,

Sect. 1503.1(a)(4): "the agency shall request comments from the public, affirmatively soliciting comments from those persons who may be interested or affected".

There has been an abject failure of the DOE to abide either by the letter or the spirit of these regulations in not posting or notifying by mail this meeting. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the majority of people most affected by the proposal to dump a massive amount of long life radioactive waste have been excluded from the decision making process. Will the agency notice future meetings at the places stated above? Will it also mail such notices to Amargosa and Beatty residents?

2 A look at the text of the NEPA shows:

Sect. 102(1)(C)(iii) of the NEPA of 1969 states(redacted to delete non relevant parts):

"All agencies of the Federal Government shall--include in every recommendation or report....., a detailed statement by the responsible official on alternatives to the proposed actions"

Where is such a statement??

3 Now, as to the proposal as I have understood it from other sources. It is proposed to store this dangerously radioactive waste in a mountain that is geologically faulted; through which water percolates in 50 years or less to the underlying aquifer; and which lies within a few miles of recent volcanism. Are we crazy, or what? Or maybe we just don't care much beyond our own life spans. Let future generations take care of themselves?

9/26/99